DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 445 206 CE 080 661

AUTHOR	Cohen, Marie
TITLE	Work Experience and Publicly-Funded Jobs for TANF Recipients.
INSTITUTION	Welfare Information Network, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.; Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, MI.; Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, New York, NY.; Ford Foundation, New York, NY.; Foundation for Child Development, New York, NY.
PUB DATE	1998-09-00
NOTE	14p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.welfareinfo.org/newwork.htm.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Information Analyses (070)
JOURNAL CIT	Issue Notes; v2 n12 Sep 1998
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; Adults; Compliance (Legal); Demonstration Programs; Disadvantaged; *Education Work Relationship; *Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Job Placement; Job Training; Models; *Policy Formation; *Public Policy; Public Sector; *Welfare Recipients; *Work Experience Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Public Employment Programs; *Temporary Assistance for Needy Families; Unpaid Labor; Welfare Reform; Welfare to Work Programs

ABSTRACT

This publication, one of a series designed to help policymakers and TANF [Temporary Assistance for Needy Families] agency personnel, offers an overview of programs providing publicly funded paid jobs in the public or nonprofit sector to TANF recipients, as well as of work experience programs in which recipients receive welfare payment in return for working. The first section asks and answers some policy questions, including: What should be the purpose of work experience or publicly funded jobs?; What are the merits of publicly funded jobs as compared to unpaid work experience?; Which TANF recipients should be placed in work experience or publicly funded jobs?; What can be done to prevent displacement of current employees?; What adjustments should be made in areas where unemployment is high?; What should the wage and hour requirements be?; What can states and localities do when work experience or publicly funded jobs do not provide enough hours to meet federal participation requirements?; What additional services should be included?; Who should administer a work experience or publicly funded jobs program?; and What funds should be used for publicly funded jobs?. The second section summarizes research findings, and the third section focuses on innovative practices in unpaid work experience and community service programs and publicly funded jobs programs. Thirteen resource contacts and 34 publications are listed. (KC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 445 206

Work Experience and Publicly-Funded Jobs for TANF Recipients

Welfare Information Network

Issue Notes
Volume 2, no. 12 September 1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B Van Lare
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CE050661

WELFARE INFORMATION NETWORK

Issue Notes

Vol. 2, No. 12 September 1998

Work Experience and Publicly-Funded Jobs for TANF Recipients

by Marie Cohen

Background

Unpaid work experience has been a component of employment programs for welfare recipients since the late 1960's. There have been two basic models of this activity. Under the Work Incentive (WIN) program, established in 1967, work experience was aimed at increasing the employability of welfare recipients by providing job experience and skills. Placements were time-limited and the number of hours worked was unrelated to the welfare grant. In 1981, Congress gave states the option of running Community Work Experience (CWEP) programs, which required AFDC recipients to work in exchange for their grants, with work hours determined by dividing the grant amount by the minimum wage. The JOBS program, which replaced WIN in 1988, incorporated both work experience models.

Past programs also have provided paid publicly funded jobs for the unemployed, including welfare recipients. The two big waves of federal job creation -- the public works projects of the New Deal and the CETA Public Service Employment (PSE) program of the 1970's -- were responses to economic depression or recession. PSE was added to WIN as an option in 1971, but it was used on a very limited basis. Federal regulations prohibited states from using JOBS funds for PSE.

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunities Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) replaced AFDC and JOBS with Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). PRWORA requires states to enroll an increasing proportion of TANF recipients in approved work activities. By restricting the use of education and training, PRWORA codified the shift toward a "Work First" approach that had already been taking place in many states. The list of approved activities, which are undefined by the law, includes work experience and community service, both of which can be defined by states to include the kind of unpaid work experience they have used in the past. However, PRWORA removes the prohibition contained in the JOBS regulations on creating *paid* jobs for welfare recipients. PRWORA also prohibits use of TANF funds to provide assistance to a family for more than 60 months, lending urgency to the effort to place welfare recipients in jobs.

In this paper, the term "publicly-funded jobs" is used to refer to programs providing paid jobs in the public or nonprofit sector to TANF recipients. The term "work experience" (often also called "community service" by states) is used to describe programs in which the recipient receives her welfare payment in return for working. The two types of programs can look quite similar. The same workplace protections seem to apply to both. According to federal guidance issued in May, 1997, federal employment laws cover participants in all PRWORA work activities unless they meet strict criteria to qualify as training. (See U.S. Department of Labor, 1997). These laws include the minimum wage. In addition, participants in both types of programs are likely to be covered under health and safety and anti-discrimination laws and state Workers' Compensation programs.

The Welfare Information Network — Barry L. Van Lare, Executive Director
A Special Activity of The Finance Project
Tel: 202-628-5790 — Website: www.welfareinfo.org — E-Mail Address: welfinfo@welfareinfo.org

A major difference between the two approaches involves the tax treatment of payments to participants. In publicly funded jobs, wages are subject to payroll taxes and treated as earned income for the purposes of income tax liability and eligibility for the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). In unpaid work experience, participants receive their welfare payments, which are not subject to payroll or income taxes but cannot be used as a basis for EITC eligibility. (See CLASP: Emsellem and Savner, 1997.)

Policy Issues

There are many policy issues involved in work experience and publicly funded jobs, and they cannot all be discussed in detail here. For more detailed discussions of these issues, see Levine, 1997; MDRC: Bloom, 1997 and Brock et al., 1993; CLASP: Emsellem and Savner, 1997; and CBPP: Johnson, 1997.

What should be the purpose of work experience or publicly-funded jobs? Both work experience and publicly-funded jobs can be seen as ways to increase the employability of welfare recipients by giving them skills and work experience. They also can be seen as ways to provide needed services to society in return for benefits and to ensure that everyone who can work does so. A program aimed at training will look for experiences that enhance employability and stress careful matching between placements, the interests of the recipient, and labor market demand, as well as close supervision and monitoring of the placements. A program aimed at providing a service to society will be more concerned with the nature of the services provided. Most programs attempt to meet both of these goals, with some variation in emphasis. Publicly funded jobs are also advocated by some as a way to provide work in areas where there are not enough jobs for all the welfare recipients required to work.

What are the merits of publicly-funded jobs as compared to unpaid work experience? The choice of an option depends on its purpose. A state or locality concerned about the lack of jobs might want to create publicly-funded jobs. Either approach might be used to enhance employability, but proponents argue that publicly-funded jobs, by resembling regular employment, are a better preparation for unsubsidized employment. Publicly-funded jobs look preferable where poverty reduction is a goal: if wages are limited to the value of a family's welfare benefit, the family will end up with more disposable income than under welfare, because the payroll tax (7.65 percent of wages) will be outweighed by the 34 or 40 percent of wages returned to the participant through the EITC. (See CLASP: Emsellem and Savner, 1997.) In terms of cost, a program that uses funds now provided as cash assistance to pay wages will probably be somewhat more costly than unpaid work experience because of the payroll taxes that the state must pay on behalf of the workers. This would total 15.3 percent if the agency chose to reimburse the employee for her payroll tax as well, as most programs are doing.

Which TANF recipients should be placed in work experience or publicly-funded jobs? Many models reserve work experience or publicly-funded jobs for welfare recipients who cannot find unsubsidized employment after a certain amount of time spent in job search. Using these placements as a last resort keeps program size and costs down and encourages private sector employment. Even if placements are used as a last resort, potential participants will present a range of work experience and barriers to employment. Some of these people may be unable to function even in a publicly created, closely supervised, training-oriented job. Agencies must decide whether to screen out some of the hardest-to-place participants or to develop modified models for them that might include fewer hours, a longer stay, or more supports. For these individuals, a modified work experience or public jobs program could be treated as the first step in a progression of activities leading to unsubsidized employment. (See Herr, et al., 1996.)

How can agencies ensure that these placements lead to regular employment? A time limit on placements is one feature often used to encourage participants to obtain regular employment. Other ways to ensure that these jobs provide a bridge to regular employment include: making sure the placements fit with participants' career goals and are in areas that are in demand from employers; involving participants in placement decisions; requiring job search and providing job development services during the placement; requiring employers to make a commitment to retaining successful employees after a trial period; providing close supervision by worksite or intermediary staff; ensuring that program staff have regular contact with the participant and the employer; providing education and training along with the work experience; establishing mentoring relationships in the workplace; and credentialing of skills learned at work. (See Taylor, 1997.)

How can work experience or publicly funded jobs be used to provide services that are valuable to the community? In the past, work experience and public service employment have often provided "make work" jobs that kept participants busy rather than providing valuable services. A variety of factors may have contributed to the creation of "make work" jobs, including the need to avoid displacing regular employees, the lack of concern about providing valuable services, and the failure to commit the resources -- such as adequate supervision -- required to produce meaningful services. The current challenge is to use publicly-funded jobs to provide needed services, especially those, such as teen pregnancy prevention and child care, that serve the goals of PRWORA. One approach being used by service and conservation corps is to involve communities in selecting projects by inviting proposals from nonprofit as well as public agencies and using a competitive project selection process. States and localities also should consider linking publicly-funded jobs with community economic development initiatives. (See CLASP: Johnson papers, 1997.)

What can be done to prevent displacement of current employees? Programs should avoid simply replacing current employees with TANF recipients without increasing total employment. PRWORA forbids placing TANF-funded participants in jobs where another individual is on layoff or where the employer has fired another worker. However, displacement can still occur within this framework, as welfare workers replace people who quit or retire. (See Finder, et al., 1998.) A stronger set of protections applies to programs funded with federal Welfare-to-Work funds. Collective bargaining agreements also contain displacement protections. Some states have enacted further protections against displacement. (Contact AFSCME and the Service Employees International Union for examples of contract language and legislation to prevent displacement.) Methods that have been suggested for avoiding displacement include: creating new projects targeted to unmet community needs; time-limiting the positions; including representatives of local organized labor on planning or project selection committees or community review boards; and using nonprofit groups rather than government agencies as worksites in time limited projects. (See CBPP: Johnson, 1997; CLASP: Emsellem and Savner, 1997; Levine, 1997; Walters, 1997.)

What adjustments should be made in areas where unemployment is high? In economically depressed areas, publicly-funded jobs may be the only employment prospect for some people. In such areas, policymakers may want to consider letting the placements last longer and/or providing more hours of work. However, this of course entails more expense.

What should the wage and hour requirements be? In a work experience program, since total compensation is capped at the grant amount, the wage that is paid determines the number of hours that are worked. While states or counties are required to pay the minimum wage, they have the option of setting a higher level and thus requiring fewer hours. This may have the advantage of being more equitable to the TANF worker, but may make it more difficult to meet participation requirements. Administrators of publicly-funded jobs have more choices to make. In the least

expensive version of publicly-funded jobs, funds now provided as cash assistance can be used to pay wages to welfare recipients at the minimum wage rate. The additional costs of such a program over and above the costs of cash assistance would be only payroll taxes, reimbursement of work-related expenses, supervision, and administration. A more costly program design could include increased work hours or wage rates higher than the minimum wage. A higher wage and/or hours might be desirable as a means of poverty reduction, but might reduce the incentive to seek unsubsidized employment, while a lower wage and/or hours would allow the creation of more jobs. Part-time work is less expensive, especially in terms of child care, and allows the work to be combined with training. Offering a higher wage may be desirable to create more equity compared with regular employees and to further protect against displacement, while a lower wage will enable the agency to obtain more hours of work, which may be needed to meet federal requirements.

What can states and localities do when work experience or publicly-funded jobs do not provide enough hours to meet federal participation requirements? Federal participation requirements will increase from 20 hours weekly for single parents in FY 1998 to 25 hours in FY 1999 and 30 hours thereafter. While states can combine the Food Stamp grant with the welfare grant for purposes of establishing work experience hours or use Food Stamps in wage subsidy programs, many may have trouble providing the hours of work required. When the required hours are not met through work experience or paid jobs, states can supplement work with other activities such as education and training (which can count as participation for 100 percent of the caseload if 20 hours are spent in work experience or jobs), raise the welfare grant, supplement the grant with other funds in order to pay the minimum wage, or not count these people as participants if they are not needed to meet the requirements.

What additional services should be included? Both work experience and publicly-funded jobs can be combined with education, training, or other employability-enhancing services. These of course raise program costs, but recent research suggests that programs combining work experience with education or training can be effective in improving employment prospects for low-income people. They can also help states to meet required work hours, as mentioned above.

Who should administer a work experience or publicly-funded jobs program? A state or locality must decide on a number of administrative questions including: which government agency will administer the program; whether the program will be part of the welfare-to-work program or separate; whether the government agency will administer the program directly or funnel the funds through intermediaries; and who is considered the employer (the government agency, the intermediary, or the worksite itself). Removing the administrative burden from the employer by making the intermediary the employer of record may make it easier to find placements.

On what scale can these programs be run? The Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC: Bloom, 1997; Brock *et al.*, 1993) has pointed out that unpaid work experience programs for AFDC recipients were generally quite small for a number of reasons, including insufficient staff to develop and monitor positions, reluctance by employers to accept welfare recipients as workers, and opposition from public employees. Moreover, an increasing preponderance of harder-to-serve individuals in the caseload may make it harder to find placements. However, some of the new work experience programs are considerably larger than past programs. Public service employment programs have been run on a larger scale: the New Deal's WPA provided work for 7.8 million Americans, while Public Service Employment under CETA involved 750,000 people at its peak. A program stressing employability development may be harder to implement on a large scale than one emphasizing obligation to society.

What funds should be used for publicly-funded jobs? Different sources of funds carry different restrictions. In addition to TANF funds, the Department of Labor's Welfare-to-Work (WtW) grants can be used to fund jobs for TANF recipients. If federal TANF, WtW funds or state maintenance-of-effort (MOE) funds commingled with federal TANF funds are used to finance jobs, time in a placement will probably count against the five-year TANF time limit. WtW funds have the advantage that they can be used for serving noncustodial parents of TANF children. Other federal funds that do not carry a time limit include funds transferred to the child care block grant (and used to provide child care jobs). A variety of HUD funds could be used for publicly created jobs, such as the Community Development Block Grant, the Economic Development Initiative, and several programs helping families in public housing achieve self-sufficiency. (See AFSCME, 1998 for descriptions of some of these programs.) Food Stamp employment and training funds are another potential source of federal funding. States also can use segregated state MOE funds or separate state funds so that participants do not use up their limited months on assistance. For further discussion of the implications of using different funding sources, see CLASP: Greenberg, 1997, and Kaplan, 1998.

Research Findings

A review of evaluations of several unpaid work experience programs run in the 1980's (MDRC, 1993) found little evidence that this activity by itself has positive effects on employment and earnings. Evaluations of programs providing paid employment have shown better results. Evaluations of the CETA PSE programs of the 1970's, while methodologically flawed, found modest positive effects on women's post-program earnings. Two programs of the 1980's -- the Supported Work Demonstration and the Homemaker-Home Health Aide Demonstration -- that combined wage-paying jobs with other services were shown to have strong positive and lasting effects on welfare recipients' employment and earnings. (See CBPP: Johnson and Lopez, 1997; CLASP: Strawn, 1998; Stanley, 1995). The supported work demonstration was characterized by close supervision, peer support, and graduated increase in work expectations and associated stress. The Homemaker-Home Health Aide demonstration provided four to eight weeks of classroom training, combined with work under close supervision, followed by up to one year of subsidized employment. An evaluation of youth corps programs (Jastrzab, 1997), which also combine education with employment, found substantial employment and earnings gains. Seen in its totality, the evaluation research suggests that publicly-funded jobs, especially when combined with education, training, or other services, are effective at increasing the future earnings of participants.

There is also evidence that the work performed by participants in paid or unpaid work experience has value to society. MDRC has found that the benefits to taxpayers of the services provided by participants in unpaid work experience usually outweighed the costs of running the programs. (See MDRC, 1993.) The AFDC Homemaker-Home Health Demonstration, CETA public service employment, and youth corps also were found to produce valuable services for society. (See Barnow, 1994; CBPP: Johnson and Lopez, 1997; and Jastrzab, 1997).

Innovative Practices

The shift to a "Work First" approach might be expected to increase the use of work experience and public jobs and, indeed, there does seem to be an increase in the use of these approaches. The most innovative approaches include close supervision and monitoring of work activities and creative ways of combining work with education and/or training. These models build upon research suggesting that contextual or experiential learning, as opposed to more traditional classroom approaches to education or training, are more effective in boosting the skills of hard-to-employ individuals.

Unpaid Work Experience and Community Service

Although there is no nationwide count of TANF recipients in different activities, early reports and research suggest that enrollment in work experience has increased since the advent of welfare reform and Work First policies, and that some states are enrolling sizeable proportions of TANF recipients in this activity. In a study of seven states, the U.S. General Accounting Office (1998) found that between 5 and 39 percent of TANF participants who were enrolled in work activities were in community service and work experience, as compared to 0 to 7 percent in the same states in 1994. Five of the states studied had more than 20 percent of their active participants in work experience.

Participants in the **IndEx** program in Tulsa spend four hours daily in education and four hours working on the shop floor, primarily in light manufacturing, for a total of about 40 hours per week. IndEx is a nonprofit subsidiary of the Metropolitan Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, which contracts with local companies to provide work in assembly and packaging. A recent modification gives participants the choice of staying on their TANF grants while participating in IndEx or receiving the minimum wage for the four hours per day that they are working. About half of IndEx participants choose the wage-paying option. Contact: IndEx, (918) 587-5307, or see MDRC: Buck, 1997.

The **Education for Gainful Employment (EDGE)** program, operated by the New York State Education Department, combines unpaid work experience with basic education and sometimes job skills training for adults with limited literacy or English language skills. The program is designed to allow participants to meet TANF requirements by combining work and study. EDGE was one of eight programs chosen by the National Institute for Literacy as models of using basic skills instruction to help welfare recipients move into the workforce. Contact: Robert Purga, Associate in Continuing Education, Department of Education, (518) 474-8920, or rpurga@mail.nysed.gov.

New York City's Work Experience Program (WEP) is the largest one in the nation and has been involving large numbers of AFDC/TANF and general assistance recipients since before the passage of federal welfare reform. WEP participants on TANF work 20 hours weekly unless their grant divided by the minimum wage cannot support 20 hours. Applicants who do not obtain employment during the 30-day application period and recipients who are determined by their caseworkers to need work experience are given a WEP assignment. Assignments are not time-limited, although clients are reassessed after six months to determine whether they need additional services. There were approximately 18,700 TANF participants in WEP in July 1998, about 7,500 of whom were participating concurrently in other activities, such as education or training. Several lawsuits are pending on various aspects of the program. Contact: Office of Public Information, Human Resources Administration, (212) 331-6200.

New York City's **Wildcat Service Corporation**, a pioneer in employment and training for welfare recipients and part of the supported work demonstration of the 1970's, provides a number of programs that combine work experience in government agencies, often under New York City's Work Experience Program, with education and training. Contact: Jeffrey Jablow, Senior Vice President, Wildcat Service Corporation, (212) 219-9700, ext. 5151.

Wisconsin's W-2 program sets up a hierarchy of activities for TANF recipients, with unsubsidized employment as the preferred option. Individuals who cannot find unsubsidized employment but have the necessary attitudes and skills are assigned to a subsidized trial job. Those who need to develop work attitudes and skills are assigned to "Community Service Jobs" (CSJ's). CSJ participants receive a monthly grant of $673 for up to 30 hours per week in work activities and up to 10 hours in education or training. Those who are deemed unable to perform independent, self-sustaining work

are assigned to "W-2 Transition," in which they receive a monthly grant of $628 and must participate for up to 28 hours per week in work experience or other developmental activities and up to 12 hours in education or training. W-2 participants are limited to 24 months in a single work option other than unsubsidized employment, with a lifetime participation limit of 60 months. As of July 31, 1998, 54 percent of the 15,896 active W-2 cases were participating in CSJ's and 14 percent were in W-2 Transition. For more information, see *http://www.dwd.state.wi.us/desw2/W2Home.htm* or contact Donna Cochems, Program Planning and Development Section Chief, Division of Economic Support, (608) 266-7889.

The Community Conservation Corps (formerly the Alternative Work Experience Program) combines unpaid work experience in nonprofit organizations with case management and a seminar on work and life skills for individuals on public assistance in Philadelphia. The classroom training uses issues that come up in the internship to help participants apply classroom lessons to work situations. (See Schneider, 1997.) Contact Gloria Kingcade or Christine Harrity, Program Coordinators, Institute for the Study of Civic Values, (215) 238-1434.

Project Match in Chicago uses volunteer activities chosen by the participant as a way to ease harder-to-serve TANF recipients into the world of work. Although somewhat different from the standard work experience program, these activities count toward the state's TANF work requirement. Agencies in several other areas are using a similar model incorporating volunteer work as an early rung on a "ladder" of work activities. Contact Project Match at (312) 755-2250 ext. 2297.

Publicly-Funded Jobs

There is a growing interest in publicly-funded jobs, especially in urban areas. Contributing to this interest may be awareness among local officials that increasing proportions of their caseloads will be required to participate in work activities, that many of the easiest-to-employ recipients have left the rolls, and that research shows that education and training are best delivered in the context of a job. A number of communities have launched small programs to test the idea of providing paid publicly-funded jobs for welfare recipients. In all of these programs, wages are subject to payroll taxes and participants are eligible for the EITC. Most of these programs reserve publicly-funded jobs for TANF recipients who cannot find a job after a certain period of job search, usually four to 12 weeks.

Vermont requires TANF participants who do not find work after reaching their time limit (30 months for single parents) to take community service jobs in public and nonprofit agencies. Workers are paid the minimum wage, using funds that would otherwise have been used for welfare checks. Participants receive workers' compensation and Social Security coverage. Positions are usually part-time, with work hours set at the level that enables a parent to earn the same amount as her previous grant. Due to the strong economy, only 232 Community Service Employment placements were used between the program's inception in November 1995 and August 1998. There were 45 active placements as of August 1998. (See CBPP: Johnson and Headings, 1998.) Contact: Steve Gold, Welfare to Work Programs Coordinator, Vermont Department of Social Welfare, (802) 241-2834.

The state of **Washington** has launched a Community Jobs Initiative (CJI), which is expected to include 2,500 participants by June 2001. All CJI participants work 20 hours per week and are paid the federal minimum wage. The cost of these wages is covered by funds previously used for cash assistance. In addition to a lack of success in job search, a potential participant must be determined by the case manager to need a supportive work environment before she can obtain and keep a regular job, and must have a monthly cash grant large enough to cover the cost of the wage. A participant can remain in a community job for up to nine months. The program is managed by five contractors,

each responsible for a different geographic area. For more information, see CBPP: Johnson, 1998. Contact: Paul Knox, Community Jobs Initiative Manager, Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development, (360) 586-8973 or *paulk@cted.wa.gov*.

Philadelphia has established a Transitional Work Program, which is expected to provide six-month positions in public and non-profit agencies for a total of 3,000 participants over a three-year period. Participants will learn skills and receive workplace support, including mentors. Participants will work 25 hours per week, with an additional 10 hours devoted to education or training. They will receive the minumum wage and a bonus of up to $800 upon placement in an unsubsidized job. A new nonprofit institution will manage the program. The cost of wages will be mostly covered by money previously used for TANF benefits, with additional funding from the state's Welfare-to-Work formula grant and the Pew Charitable Trusts. Contact: Linda Blanchette, Personnel Department, (215) 686-2383 or *linda.blanchette@phila.gov*, or Margy Waller, Director of Policy Development, Public/Private Ventures, (215) 557-4400 or *mwaller@ppv.org*.

Detroit will use its Welfare-to-Work formula grant to create 2,000 six-month full-time wage-paying jobs, starting September 1998, for TANF recipients who do not find a job after four to six weeks of searching. Participants will be placed with public, nonprofit and for-profit employers who agree to hire suitable participants after their placements end. Participants will receive wages comparable to employees in similar jobs (expected to range from $6 to $8 per hour) and most jobs will start at 25 hours per week. Six contractors will set up the worksites, and two other agencies will handle the payroll. Contact: Joseph Egalski, Deputy Director, Employment and Training, (313) 876-0679.

San Francisco has obtained a federal WtW competitive grant to create a pilot program providing temporary, transitional community jobs for 200 TANF recipients. Wages will be covered by converting the TANF grant into a wage, which will be supplemented by WtW funds and the EITC. A nonprofit corporation will serve as the employer of record. Contact: Trent Rohrer, *Trent_Rhorer@ci.sf.ca.us*.

The **New Hope Project** in Milwaukee, a demonstration project supported with federal, state, and private funds, offers paid six-month community service jobs (CSJ's) in nonprofit and public agencies to participants who cannot find work after eight weeks of searching. Participants receive the minimum wage and are eligible for a supplement if necessary to bring their income above poverty. After six months, a participant must leave the job and seek employment for three weeks before qualifying for an additional community service assignment. An individual is limited to two CSJ's in total. Of a sample of New Hope participants followed for 12 months, about one-fourth worked in a CSJ at some point. Contact Julie Kerksick, Project Director at (414)342-3338, or see *http://www.lafollette.wisc.edu/newhope/nh_info.htm* or MDRC: Brock et al., 1997.

Service and Conservation Corps combine work on environmental or human service projects with education and life skills training for young adults. An evaluation found that participants' employment and earnings were substantially increased. Several corps now have contracts with welfare agencies to serve TANF recipients. Contact: Andy Moore, Vice President, National Association of Service and Conservation Corps, (202) 737-6272 or *nascc@nascc.org*.

Over 3,000 young people in 35 states participate in **YouthBuild**, typically spending half their time building or renovating affordable housing and half their time in educational activities. YouthBuild USA has received a $4.7 million federal WtW grant to use its model to help welfare recipients in ten sites. Participants will receive nine to 12 months of subsidized community service employment,

learning construction skills. At the same time, they will earn their high school or equivalency degree and receive education and life skills counseling. Contact Youthbuild, (617) 623-9900.

The **IndEx** program in Tulsa, mentioned in the work experience section above, offers clients the option to be paid wages -- rather than their TANF grants -- for their work.

The **Preparatory Employment Program**, part of the Seattle Jobs Initiative funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, will place 50 hard-to-employ welfare recipients in closely-supervised jobs paying $8 per hour. The program combines on-the-job and classroom training. Worksite supervisors receive training and ongoing support to help them set clear goals for participants, including expected time frames for developing specific employment competencies. Participants' wages are funded with a combination of TANF funds, employer contributions, and funds from the Seattle Jobs Initiative. Contact: Anne Keeney, Sector Manager, Seattle Jobs Initiative, (206) 628-6970.

Federal Work/Study funds can be used to establish paying jobs for TANF recipients attending post-secondary schools so they can combine work with education. The **California** legislature has appropriated state funds for work-study as part of a funding package designed to help community colleges respond to welfare reform. Contact: Kathleen Nelson, Coordinator, GAIN/Welfare Reform Program, California Community Colleges, (916) 324-2353 or Henry Smith, Senior Policy Analyst, U.S. Department of Education, (202) 401-0414, or see CBPP: Johnson, August 1998.

For More Information . . .

RESOURCE CONTACTS

AFL-CIO, Marc Baldwin, Assistant Director for Policy, (202) 637-5202.

AFSCME, Marie Monrad, Director of Public Policy, (202) 429-1000.

The Center for Community Change is helping community-based organizations organize in support of creating publicly funded jobs for TANF recipients. Contact Jerry Jones, Director of Jobs Policy Initiatives, (860) 527-2422 or *jonesj@commchange.org*.

The Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) are providing technical assistance to states and localities interested in setting up publicly funded jobs programs. Contact Steve Savner, Senior Staff Attorney, CLASP, (202) 328-5118 or *ssavner@clasp.org* and Cliff Johnson, Senior Fellow, CBPP, (202) 408-1080 or *johnnsonc@cbpp.org*.

Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, Dan Bloom, Senior Research Associate, (212) 532-3200.

National Employment Law Project, Maurice Emsellem, Policy Director, (212) 285-3025 ext. 106 or Alicia Ybarra, Organizing Campaign Liaison, (212) 285-3025 ext. 113.

National Governors' Association, Susan Golonka, Program Director for Welfare Reform(202) 624-5967 or Rebecca Brown, Senior Staff Assistant, (202) 624-5300.

The National Urban League has received a planning grant from the Annie E. Casey Foundation to help build support for publicly-funded jobs initatives for TANF recipients in five communities. Contact Janet Zobel, Senior Policy Advisor, (212) 558-5350.

Public/Private Ventures is working with the City of Philadelphia on its publicly-funded jobs program for TANF recipients. Contact Margy Waller, Director of Policy Development, or Mark Alan Hughes, Vice President, (215) 557-4400.

Service Employees' International Union, Pat Greenfield, (202) 898-3271.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration on Children and Families, Mack Storrs, Director, Division of Self-Sufficiency, Office of Family Assistance, (202) 401-9289.

U.S. Department of Labor, Alicia Fernandez-Mott, Team Leader, Welfare-to-Work Technical Assistance, (202) 208-7281 ext. 183 or *afernandez@doleta.gov*.

Urban Institute, Demetra Nightingale, Principal Research Associate, (202) 261-5570 or Pamela Holcomb, Senior Research Associate, (202) 261-5618.

PUBLICATIONS

AFSCME, *Thinking Creatively About Welfare-To-Work Job Creation.* Washington, DC: July 1988. (202) 429-1155 or see *www.afscme.org*.

Barnow, Burt, *The U.S. Experience with Public Service Employment Programs.* Johns Hopkins University, 1994, (410) 516-5388.

Center for Law and Social Policy, selected resources, (202) 328-5140 or *www.clasp.org*.

- *Beyond Job Search or Basic Education: Rethinking the Role of Skills in Welfare Reform*, by Julie Strawn, April 1998.
- *Community Service Employment: A New Opportunity Under TANF*, by Steve Savner and Mark Greenberg, November 1997.
- *Funding Community Service Employment in the TANF Framework*, by Mark Greenberg, November 1997.
- *The Fiscal and Legal Framework For Creating a Community Service Employment Program*, by Maurice Emsellem and Steve Savner, November 1997.

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, selected resources, (202) 428-1080 or *www.cbpp.org*.

- *Layperson's Guide to Community Job Creation*, by Clifford Johnson, November 1997.
- *Publicly-funded Jobs for Hard-to-Employ Welfare Recipients*, by Clifford Johnson, July 1998.
- *Shattering the Myth of Failure: Promising Findings from Ten Public Job Creation Initiatives*, by Clifford Johnson and Ana Lopez, 1997.
- *Toward a New Generation of Community Jobs Programs*, by Cliffford Johnson, July 1997.
- *Vermont's Community Service Employment Program*, by Clifford Johnson and Mark Headings, July 1998.
- *Washington State's Community Jobs Initiative*, by Clifford Johnson, May 1998.
- *Work-Study Programs for Welfare Recipients: A Job Creation Strategy that Combines Work and Education*, by Clifford Johnson, August 1998.

Finder, Alan; Greenhouse, Steven; Swarns, Rachel; and Toy, Vivian; Series on Workfare in New York City, New York Times, April 11-15, 1998.

Herr, Toby, et al., *Making the Shoe Fit: Creating a Work-Prep System for a Large and Diverse Welfare Population.* Chicago: Erikson Institute, 1996. (312) 755-2250 ext. 2296/2297.

Holcomb, Pamela, et al., *Building an Employment-Focused Welfare System: Work First and Other Work-Oriented Strategies in Five States.* Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. See *www.urban.org* or *http://aspe.os.dhhs.gov/*.

Institute for Women's Policy Research, "Workfare." *IWPR Welfare Reform Network News*, April 30, 1997. *http://www.iwpr.org/WRNN5.HTM* or (202) 785-5100.

Jastrzab, J.; et al., *Youth Corps: Promising Strategies for Young People and their Communities.* Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, 1997.

Kaplan, Jan, *State-Only Programs and the TANF Block Grant.* Washington, D.C.: Welfare Information Network, September 1998. *www.welfareinfo.org* or (202) 628-5790.

Levine, Linda, *Welfare Reform and Subsidized Public Sector Jobs.* Washington, DC: U.S. Congressional Research Service, 1997. (301) 229-8229.

Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, selected publications. (212) 532-3200 or *www.mdrc.org*.

- *After AFDC: Welfare-to-Work Choices and Challenges for States*, by Dan Bloom, 1997.
- *Creating New Hope: Implementation of a Program to Reduce Poverty and Reform Welfare*, by Thomas Brock, et al., 1997.
- *Tulsa's IndEx Program: A Business-Led Initiative for Welfare Reform and Economic Development*, by Maria Buck, 1997.
- *Unpaid Work Experience for Welfare Recipients: Findings and Lessons from MDRC Research*, by Thomas Brock, et al.,1993.
- *Work First: How to Implement an Employment-Focused Approach to Welfare Reform*, by Amy Brown, 1997.

National Employment Law Project, *Job Creation Serving Community Needs -- Welfare to Work Initiatives from Across the Nation.* June 8, 1998. (212) 285-3025, ext. 106.

Schneider, Joanne, *Making Workfare a Success.* Philadelphia, PA: Institute for the Study of Civic Values, 1997. (215) 238-1434. Executive summary at *www.libertynet.org/~edcivic/aweprept.html*

Service Employees International Union, assorted publications, including *Fairness for All Workers: A Workfare Organizing and Bargaining Guide* (1997) and *Building a Future that works: Welfare Reform and SEIU.* (202) 898-3200.

Stanley, Marcus, *What's Working (and What's Not): A Summary of Research on the Economic Impacts of Employment and Training Programs.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1995. (202) 219-8211.

Taylor, Judith Combes, *Learning at Work in a Work-Based Welfare System: Opportunities and Obstacles: Lessons from the School-to-Work Experience.* Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future, 1997. (617) 742-5995.

U.S. General Accounting Office, *Welfare Reform: States Are Restructuring Programs to Reduce Welfare Dependence*. Washington, DC: June, 1998. GAO/HEHS-98-109. (202) 512-6000 or *http://www.gao.gov/new.items/he98109.pdf*.

U.S. Department of Labor, *How Workplace Laws Apply to Welfare Recipients*. May 1997. *http://www.dol.gov/dol/asp/public/w2w/welfare.htm*.

Walters, Jonathan, "Why Unions Hate Workfare." *Governing*, November 1997. *www.governing.com/11work.htm*

The author greatly appreciates the very helpful comments provided by Cliff Johnson and Steve Savner, and thanks the many others who provided information for this paper.

The Welfare Information Network is supported by grants from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Foundation for Child Development.

For immediate access to many of the organizations and publications listed here and for information on more than 40 program and management issues, use WIN's website:

WWW.WELFAREINFO.ORG

WELFARE INFORMATION NETWORK

1000 Vermont Ave., NW - Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005